

ITEMS

VOLUME 6 • NUMBER 2 • JUNE 1952
230 PARK AVENUE • NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

FELLOWS OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL, 1925-1951: SOME STATISTICS

by Joseph B. Casagrande and Elbridge Sibley

Fellows of the Social Science Research Council, 1925-1951,¹ the recently published biographical directory, provides a basis for a comprehensive statistical description of the 1,028 persons who have held Council fellowships during the quarter century from 1925 through September 1951. The statistics which follow do not by any means exhaust the information contained in the biographies, nor do they purport to show what has been accomplished by the Council's investment in its fellows. To quote from the introduction to the directory, "The care with which fellows have been selected is evident from their achievements." Although the contribution of the fellowships to making possible these achievements cannot be measured, circumstantial evidence suggests that it has been considerable.

THE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMS

Ten categories of fellowships have been offered by the Council since 1925; three of these—Research Training Fellowships, Area Research Training Fellowships, and Faculty Research Fellowships—are currently active. The ultimate purpose of all programs has been that for which the Council itself is chartered, namely, the advancement of research in social science. The training of research workers has been the immediate objective of all except the Faculty Research Fellowships and the Southern Fellowships, the former of which are intended to afford younger faculty members opportunities for significant independent research, while the latter were offered to persons not necessarily committed to research careers.

¹ Published by the Council, 1951. Preparation of the directory was made possible by a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation.

A brief description of each category of fellowships follows. The first three categories, Research, Field, and Research Training Fellowships, which comprise more than half of the total number of appointments during the 27-year period, have constituted in effect a continuous program for late predoctoral and postdoctoral training in research, embracing all the social science fields. The remaining seven programs have been specialized with respect to subject matter or clientele, or restricted to earlier or later stages of the holders' careers.

Research Fellowships, 1925-34, 198 appointments. Available to persons holding the Ph.D. degree or its equivalent in training and experience.

Field Fellowships, 1935-46, 157 appointments. Open to advanced graduate students at the predoctoral level for field training away from their own universities.

Research Training Fellowships, 1935 to present, 264 appointments. Prior to 1946 these awards were open only to holders of the doctorate or equivalent credentials, but since 1946 they have also been available to predoctoral students.²

Agricultural Fellowships, 1928-33, 106 appointments. Under these awards, more precisely designated as Fellowships in Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, each fellow attended an accredited graduate school to gain increased theoretical and technical competence in his own field. No age limit was set and no advanced academic degree was required.

Southern Fellowships, 1929-33, 59 appointments. These fellowships were intended to interest potential intellectual leaders of the South in the scientific study

² For a statement and illustrations of current policy governing the Research Training Fellowship program, see *Items*, June 1949, pp. 18-19.

of social problems of that region. They were open to graduate students of social sciences in accredited Southern colleges and universities, preference being given to students under 30 years of age who had little or no previous graduate schooling.

Graduate Study Fellowships, 1935-37, 22 appointments. These awards were made to college seniors, nominated by their social science teachers, to enable them to begin graduate work. The fellowships were renewable for a second year, after which more than half (13) of the appointees received Field Fellowships for a third year's training.

Demobilization Awards, 1944-46, 151 appointments. The purpose of these awards was to reclaim for social science some of the ablest and potentially most productive research workers whose careers had been interrupted by World War II.

Economic History Fellowships, 1947-49, 10 appointments. Graduate students in the United States and Canada were eligible for these fellowships, more fully designated National Fellowships in Economic History, after completing at least one year of graduate study. Preference was given to students planning dissertations on topics in economic history of special interest to the Council's Committee on Economic History, which administered these awards.

Area Research Training Fellowships, 1948 to present, 100 appointments. Both predoctoral and postdoctoral fellowships are available to persons with previous training in some social science discipline who desire training as specialists in the contemporary culture of a major world area outside the United States. A normal upper age limit of 40 years was announced for postdoctoral applicants.

Faculty Research Fellowships, 1950 to present, 12 appointments. These awards are offered as an experiment in enabling exceptionally able scholars in their late twenties or thirties to devote at least half their time to their own research while continuing to teach. Awards are made only to regular faculty members of colleges and universities in the United States who have already made significant research contributions after receiving the doctorate. The term of each fellowship is three years.

A total of 1,079 appointments have been made, several persons having held two, and a few three, fellowships.

With the exceptions noted above, all Council fellowships have been open to citizens or permanent residents of the United States and Canada, and at the predoctoral level preference is usually given to persons who have not yet passed their thirtieth birthday, the age limit having been raised since World War II. The upper age limit at the postdoctoral level has normally been 35 years;

however, age limits have not been rigidly applied, especially in the case of men whose careers have been interrupted by long periods of war service. Fellowships have usually been granted for a period of 12 months.

The Research, Field, Research Training, Agricultural, Graduate Study, and Economic History Fellowships, and the Demobilization Awards have been supported from funds provided by the Rockefeller Foundation, the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, and the General Education Board. The Area Research Training Fellowships and the Faculty Research Fellowships have been supported by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and the Southern Fellowships by the Julius Rosenwald Fund.

STATISTICS OF FELLOWS

Only 76 or 71½ percent of the 1,028 fellows were women. This very unequal sex distribution can probably be ascribed to the infrequency with which women continue through life as research workers in the social sciences, rather than to any misogynistic bias on the part of the selection committees.

Economics heads the list of disciplinary fields represented; history is in second place; political science and sociology are next. Table 1 summarizes the results of a classification of 970 fellows who have been active in social science fields, by fields of training or later specialization.³ In this table individuals are counted more than once if they have specialized in more than one discipline.

TABLE 1
ACADEMIC FIELDS OF FELLOWS ACTIVE IN SOCIAL SCIENCE FIELDS

	Number of specialists	Specialists as percent of fellows in social science fields ^a
Anthropology	97	10
Economics	339	35
Geography	22	2
History	180	19
International law and relations	39	4
Law	20	2
Political science	143	15
Population	15	2
Psychology	74	8
Sociology	143	15
Statistics	20	2

^a 970 persons tabulated in the directory, pp. 460-473.

Unless otherwise specified, in all other tables that follow, the statistics refer to the 856 fellows of all categories except the Agricultural, Economic History, and Southern. These three categories are excluded because

³ *Fellows of the Social Science Research Council, 1925-1951*, pp. 460-473.

the first two were restricted as to disciplines and the last was geographically restricted. All other fellowships have been open to all social science disciplines and to residents of the entire United States and Canada, except that the Faculty Research Fellowships have been limited to the United States.⁴

GEOGRAPHICAL ORIGINS AND DISTRIBUTIONS

Roughly speaking, as shown in Table 2, one third of the fellows were born in the northeastern United States, another third in the north central states (using the divisions defined by the U. S. Bureau of the Census); one tenth each in the western states, in the southern states, and outside North America; and one thirtieth in

sion that the numbers of fellows from southern states are less than proportionate. Fellows born in the Pacific Coast states constituted 14 per million of the total population of that region; in the New England, Middle Atlantic, East North Central and Mountain divisions, 10 to 11 per million; in the West North Central states, 8; in the South Atlantic states, 4; and in the South Central states, only 2½ per million. Canada has contributed 4 fellows per million of its 1911 population.

As they went to colleges and subsequently to graduate schools, natives of the South Central and Mountain states, and to a lesser extent those born in the South Atlantic and West North Central divisions, tended to move to other regions. The currents of academic migra-

TABLE 2
BIRTHPLACES, PLACES OF UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE STUDY, AND PRESENT LOCATIONS OF FELLOWS

Region	Born in region		Taking bachelor's degree in region		Taking doctor's degree in region ^a		Now located in region ^b	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Total	856	100	856	100	856	100	856	100
U. S. census divisions								
New England	65	8	130	15	215	25	99	14
Middle Atlantic	210	25	194	23	243	28	170	23
East North Central	194	23	218	26	219	26	131	18
West North Central	93	11	73	9	37	4	39	5
South Atlantic	44	5	35	4	27	3	141 ^c 49 ^d	19 ^c 7 ^d
East South Central	17	2	13	2	2	...	11	2
West South Central	28	3	12	1	2	...	8	1
Mountain	28	3	19	2	3	...	8	1
Pacific	59	7	107	12	79	9	86	12
U. S. Territories	2	...	1	...	0	...	3	...
Canada	30	4	26	3	1	...	7	1
Latin America	1	...	0	...	0	...	4	1
Europe	81	9	20	2	27	3	12	2
Near East, Africa, Asia, Pacific Islands	4	...	2	...	0	...	8	1
Unclassified ^b	—	—	6	—	1	—	129	—

^a Place of highest graduate study in the case of those who have not received the doctorate.

^b Percentages in the last column are based on the total of 727 persons whose employment is known, excluding the deceased, retired, those who are now students, and those whose present location is unknown.

^c Total for this area.

^d Excluding 92 federal government employees in the District of Columbia.

Canada. Comparison of the numbers of fellowship holders with the total population in 1910 of the regions in which they were born confirms the prevailing impres-

sion that the numbers of fellows from southern states are less than proportionate. Fellows born in the Pacific Coast states constituted 14 per million of the total population of that region; in the New England, Middle Atlantic, East North Central and Mountain divisions, 10 to 11 per million; in the West North Central states, 8; in the South Atlantic states, 4; and in the South Central states, only 2½ per million. Canada has contributed 4 fellows per million of its 1911 population.

As they went to colleges and subsequently to graduate schools, natives of the South Central and Mountain states, and to a lesser extent those born in the South Atlantic and West North Central divisions, tended to move to other regions. The currents of academic migra-

⁴ As only 12 of the latter are included, the statistics are not greatly biased by this limitation.

TABLE 3
RELATIVE NUMBERS, BASED ON TABLE 2

Region	Born in region	Taking bachelor's degree in region	Taking Ph.D. or highest graduate study in region	Now employed in region ^a
New England	100	200	331	152
Middle Atlantic	100	92	116	81
East North Central	100	112	113	68
West North Central	100	78	40	42
South Atlantic	100	80	61	320 ^b 111 ^c
South Central	100	56	9	42
Mountain	100	68	11	29
Pacific	100	181	134	146
Canada	100	87	3	23

^a See Table 2, note b.

^b Including federal government employees in the District of Columbia.

^c Excluding those employees.

the South Atlantic states, followed by New England and the Pacific states, seem to be the chief "importing" areas. If federal government employees in the District of Columbia are excluded, the South Atlantic still shows a net gain, but relatively smaller than that of the latter divisions. All other areas show an excess of "exports" over "imports," the relative net losses being greatest for Canada and the Mountain states. Next in order of relative out-migration come the South Central and West North Central states. The net out-migration from the East North Central States is relatively less, and that from the Middle Atlantic division is negligible.

PLACES OF STUDY

In view of the prominence given in recent years to studies of the undergraduate origins of natural scientists, it is of interest that, as shown in Table 4, 485 out of 856 fellows received their bachelor's degrees at universities which are now members of the Association of American Universities, while only 146 were graduates of independent liberal arts colleges. Nevertheless, three such colleges are among the 21 institutions listed in Table 5,

TABLE 4
SOURCES OF BACHELOR'S DEGREES OF FELLOWS

	Number of fellows	Percent of total
Total	856	100
Universities belonging to the Association of American Universities	485	57
Independent liberal arts colleges in U. S. and Canada	146	17
Other institutions in U. S. and Canada	196	23
Foreign institutions	23	3
No bachelor's degree or unclassified	6	1

from which 10 or more fellows received their A.B.'s or B.S.'s. A total of 188 colleges and universities in the United States and Canada, and institutions in 12 foreign countries have conferred undergraduate degrees upon the 856 fellows.

TABLE 5
UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES FROM WHICH 10 OR MORE FELLOWS
RECEIVED THEIR BACHELOR'S DEGREES

	Number of fellows	Percent of total
Total number of fellows	856	100
Harvard University	53	6.2
University of Chicago	44	5.1
City College, New York	40	4.7
University of California, Berkeley	38	4.4
Columbia University	31	3.6
University of Michigan	31	3.6
University of Wisconsin	31	3.6
Yale University	24	2.8
Princeton University	22	2.6
University of Minnesota	21	2.5
Cornell University	19	2.2
Stanford University	15	1.8
University of Pennsylvania	14	1.6
University of Washington	14	1.6
University of Illinois	13	1.5
Northwestern University	13	1.5
Oberlin College	13	1.5
Ohio State University	12	1.4
University of Toronto	12	1.4
Amherst College	11	1.3
Reed College	10	1.2
Institutions listed above	481	56.2
All others	375	43.8

The list of universities in which fellows received the doctoral degree, or last pursued graduate study if they had not yet received that degree, is of course much shorter than that of their undergraduate institutions. Forty-two universities in the United States and Canada, and 12 in foreign countries are represented. Three universities account for 48 percent of the total. Institutions attended by 10 or more fellows are shown in Table 6.

A considerable proportion, over two fifths, of the fellows spent all or some part of their terms in foreign parts of the world. Especially in the years before World War II, large numbers of fellows studied or carried on research in Europe, even though many of them did not intend to be what is now known as "area specialists." Since 1948, Area Research Training fellows have been required to go abroad, excepting only those whose areas of interest are closed to American students and scholars. The numbers who worked abroad during their fellowship terms are shown in Table 7.

TABLE 6

INSTITUTIONS IN WHICH 10 OR MORE FELLOWS RECEIVED THE PH.D.
DEGREE, OR PURSUED ADVANCED GRADUATE STUDY

	Number of fellows	Percent of total
Total number of fellows	856	100
Columbia University	152	17.8
Harvard University	141	16.5
University of Chicago	114	13.3
Yale University	52	6.1
University of California, Berkeley	48	5.6
University of Wisconsin	35	4.1
Cornell University	30	3.5
University of Michigan	30	3.5
University of Pennsylvania	30	3.5
University of Minnesota	25	2.9
Princeton University	25	2.9
Stanford University	22	2.6
Northwestern University	21	2.5
Johns Hopkins University	15	1.8
Ohio State University	12	1.4
Mass. Institute of Technology	11	1.3
Institutions listed above	763	89.1
All others (38 institutions)	93	10.9

TABLE 7

FELLOWS WHO SPENT ALL OR PART OF THEIR TERMS ABROAD

	Number of fellows	Percent of total
Total number of fellows	856	100
Western Europe	226	26.4
Latin America	52	6.1
Japan and Pacific Islands	23	2.7
Africa	18	2.1
Southern Asia and Islands	17	2.0
Near and Middle East	13	1.5
Eastern Europe and U.S.S.R.	12	1.4
China and Mongolia	6	.7
India and Pakistan	4	.5
Polar Regions	3	.4
All foreign areas	374	43.7

OCCUPATIONS

Almost three fourths of the actively employed fellows are members of college and university faculties. Federal government service claims the next largest number—15 percent of the total. Eight percent are engaged in other employment as social scientists, and only 4 percent are in occupations outside the scope of the social sciences. Table 8 shows the data in detail.

As noted above, Tables 2-8 have referred to all categories of fellows except the Agricultural, Economic History, and Southern. From the special provisions of the

TABLE 8

OCCUPATIONS OF EMPLOYED FELLOWS

	Numbers	Percent of total	Percent of those employed
Total number of fellows	856	100	—
Number employed	727	—	100
Academic	532	62	73
U. S. government	107	12	15
Other social science occupations	56	7	8
All other occupations	32	4	4
On fellowship, or student	94	11	—
Retired or unemployed	7	1	—
Deceased	20	2	—
Unknown	8	1	—

Agricultural and Southern Fellowship programs one would expect their participants to be distributed somewhat differently from the other fellows. In Table 9 this is shown to be the case, with disproportionate numbers of Agricultural fellows employed by the federal government (chiefly in the Department of Agriculture), and about one fifth of the Southern fellows now engaged in occupations outside the social science fields.

TABLE 9

OCCUPATIONS OF SPECIAL CATEGORIES OF FELLOWS

	Agricultural fellows			Southern fellows		
	Percent			Percent		
	No.	Of total	Of employed	No.	Of total	Of employed
Total number of fellows	106	100	—	59	100	—
Number employed	96	—	100	47	—	100
Academic	45	42	47	28	47	60
U. S. government	34	32	35	5	8	11
Other social science occupations	11	10	11	4	7	9
All other occupations	6	6	6	10	17	21
Retired or unemployed	2	2	—	7	12	—
Deceased	7	7	—	2	3	—
Unknown	1	1	—	3	5	—

OTHER AWARDS

Since September 1951, 80 fellowships have been awarded or have become effective, bringing the number of appointments from the initiation of the Council's fellowship programs to 1,159.

In addition to fellowships, the Council has granted financial assistance to individuals under three titles, namely, Grants-in-Aid, special Southern Grants-in-Aid, and Travel Grants for Area Research. None of these awards provide maintenance as do the fellowships; they are applicable only to the direct costs of research projects.

THE COMMITTEE ON MIGRATION DIFFERENTIALS AND ITS RELATION TO OTHER COUNCIL ACTIVITIES

by Dorothy Swaine Thomas

THE appointment of the Council's present Committee on Migration Differentials in the fall of 1950 was occasioned directly by the needs and interests of the Committee on Economic Growth—itsself appointed some 18 months earlier to explore desirable ways of studying long-term changes in the magnitude and structure of nations or other large social units. In a discussion of suggestions for research on regional aspects of economic growth in the United States, that committee¹ concluded in October 1949 that further research on this subject was dependent upon a prior ordering of current knowledge concerning population migration. It recommended to the Council that it provide for an appraisal of research findings on internal migration, primarily in the United States, since 1938, to bring up to date the analysis and annotated bibliographies published in that year as Council Bulletin 43, *Research Memorandum on Migration Differentials*, which was prepared for a former Council committee in that field.² As the result of this recommendation the Committee on Problems and Policy appointed the new committee, consisting of Donald J. Bogue, Margaret J. Hagood, C. Horace Hamilton, Edward P. Hutchinson, Henry S. Shryock, Jr., and Dorothy S. Thomas (chairman), to serve as an advisory body for the preparation of a revision of Bulletin 43. Everett S. Lee was engaged as committee staff and with the guidance of this group, and of Daniel O. Price and T. van den Brink as consultants, he has reviewed the relevant research findings published since 1938 and drafted the contents of a revised bulletin.

The orientation and scope of the 1938 bulletin, the needs it served, and the rationale of the plan for the 1950-52 revision can perhaps be illuminated by a brief recapitulation of the Council's long-standing interest in population research. This interest predates the formal organization of the Council. At the meeting on February 24, 1923, of two representatives each of the American Economic Association, the American Political Science

Association, and the American Sociological Society, held "to consider the organization of a research council in the social sciences," one of the first actions was to recommend cooperation with the National Research Council in the latter's ongoing Study of Human Migration. Three months later, the Social Science Research Council was formally organized around this nucleus of economists, political scientists, and sociologists, and during its first sessions concluded "that the very excellent studies of the physical aspects of migration and of migrants planned by the . . . National Research Council left without coverage complex and significant questions of a character essentially social." First steps were therefore taken to develop a series of studies of migration from the social standpoint. According to the Council's *Decennial Report, 1923-1933*, "This episode had a marked influence on the development of the Council." It helped to resolve a major issue then under debate by the newly organized body, namely "whether it should confine itself chiefly to advising and counselling" or whether it should actively outline, promote, and implement research projects. It was the conclusion a decade later that "The situation to which the Council was introduced in the field of migration undoubtedly precipitated the interest in actual research which it has since maintained."³

In the spring of 1924 the Council obtained its first research grant: \$18,000 for a study of migration and the mechanization of industry under the newly-formed Committee on Scientific Aspects of Human Migration. During the next five years this committee and its successor, the Advisory Committee on Population, laid out and supervised a comprehensive plan of research which yielded an extraordinarily distinguished series of publications. Among these were the monumental statistical-historical compilation, interpretation, and analysis of data on international migrations directed by Walter F. Willcox for the National Bureau of Economic Research.⁴ Included also were a number of integrated studies on Negro migration from the South, directed by Frank A. Ross. One of these was Clyde V. Kiser's pioneering attempt to disentangle some of the economic, psycho-

¹ The members were Simon Kuznets (chairman), J. M. Clark, Edgar M. Hoover, Wilbert E. Moore, Lauriston Sharp, and Joseph J. Spengler. Mr. Clark has since been succeeded by Shepard B. Clough and Mr. Sharp by Morris E. Opler.

² The members of the committee were Rudolf Heberle, Edward P. Hutchinson, Frank Lorimer, Frederick F. Stephan, and Dorothy S. Thomas (chairman). The *Research Memorandum* was prepared by the chairman, and contained contributions by Rudolf Heberle, Edward P. Hutchinson, Eleanor C. Isbell, Fritz Meyer, and Svend Riemer.

³ *Decennial Report*, p. 4.

⁴ *International Migrations*, 2 vols. edited by Willcox, Vol. I compiled by I. Ferenczi (New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1929, 1931).

logical, and cultural factors at both origin and destination, as they affected the course, timing, magnitude, and characteristics of an identifiable stream of migrants from St. Helena Island, South Carolina to particular cities.⁵ Paul S. Taylor's monographs on Mexican labor in the United States,⁶ which provided important data and insights on problems involved in the assimilation of Mexican migrants into American communities, constituted a third major group of publications under the auspices of this committee.

Although the Advisory Committee on Population was discontinued in 1929, there was apparently no slackening of interest in population research on the part of the Council, for two additional committees in the field were appointed within the next two years. Not until 1934, however, did the Council again sponsor a project in population research, and this was in response to the recommendation of its Committee on Commissions of Inquiry on Public Problems that the redistribution of population then taking place in the United States be examined. Funds were obtained by the Council for a major study to be carried on at the University of Pennsylvania, and a Committee on Population Redistribution was appointed with Joseph H. Willits as chairman to serve in an advisory capacity. This research project was clearly stimulated by the economic emergency of the early depression years, and by the unprecedented measures that were being undertaken or proposed by the federal government to alleviate unemployment by moving and redistributing population. Directed towards assessing the economic gains that might be achieved through migrations and balancing these against the social costs of community dislocation and human uprooting, the study utilized both comparative and historical approaches, and systematized statistical and other data bearing on both unguided and controlled migration. It formed the basis of a comprehensive report⁷ by Carter Goodrich, director of the study, and associates, and of a series of supplementary monographs, primarily methodological in scope (e.g., C. Warren Thornthwaite's analysis of net internal migration).

Also occasioned by the need for research on depression effects was the appointment of a Council Committee on Social Aspects of the Depression in 1936. Of the 13 research memoranda prepared and published under its auspices by the end of 1937, three dealt with population phenomena during the depression years: S. A. Stouffer and Paul F. Lazarsfeld's on the family, Warren S.

Thompson's on internal migration, and Donald Young's on minority peoples.

The orientation of these two committees formed during the 1930's was undoubtedly attributable, as Donald Young pointed out, to the fact that population problems were then receiving "exceptional attention both from laymen as matters of social policy and from social scientists as a field of research promising contributions to public welfare."⁸ Thus, the formation of the Committee on Population Redistribution was regarded as "one effort of the Social Science Research Council to aid in making available for public purposes the knowledge and experiences of social scientists during the depression." But it is significant that the Committee on Migration Differentials was also established during depression, in 1936, and "while undoubtedly in part a product of the times, was [in contrast to these other committees] given no mandate of immediate public service but was rather requested to devote itself to the development of research within its province. More specifically, the assigned task was to examine the field confided to it, to gather what is in some measure known at some focus within the field, and to suggest immediate next steps in research to consolidate and expand this base."⁹ The freedom thus given this committee was extremely important, in enabling it to focus upon the scientific aspects of the field and to develop standards that would have been unrealistically perfectionist if the immediate goal had been knowledge for practical application.

As its focus the committee selected "migration differentials within the larger field of internal migration"; and in assessing the existing state of knowledge bearing upon this topic the committee had to find its way through a chaotic, ill-defined, and unsystematized mass of what seemed to be planlessly empirical studies on the one hand or dataless speculative essays on the other. Almost the only scientifically acceptable American studies dealt either with the unprecedented northward movement of Negroes after World War I or with the dramatic uprooting of peoples from areas of distress during the severe depression of the 1930's. Excellent as some of these studies were, the committee found that even they suffered from a lack of knowledge of migrations and migrants under less extreme conditions, and that there were few norms against which their findings could be evaluated. Viewed retrospectively, this pessimistic appraisal by the committee is less surprising than it seemed at the time. Not only were there no "direct" data on internal migration in the United States census

⁵ *Sea Island to City* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932).

⁶ University of California Publications in Economics, Vols. VI and VII, 1928-32.

⁷ *Migration and Economic Opportunity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1936).

⁸ Foreword in *Research Memorandum on Migration Differentials*, p. vii.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. viii.

or other official sources at that period, but there were actually no words in the English language to differentiate persons who moved within the nation from those who crossed national boundaries. Consistent use of the words "in-migrants" and "out-migrants" (translations of the equivalent Swedish, Dutch, and German terms) as counterparts of "immigrants" and "emigrants" helped to reduce the confusion in regard to terminology and classification.

The committee examined critically the hypotheses that had been developed about the direction and nature of selection in internal migration, and appraised the adequacy of the data presented and the appropriateness of the measurements and techniques used in available American studies. It also tapped sources, selectively, in countries where the interest had been more consistent, or where the data were superior to those in the United States, in order that research planning might take advantage of accumulated experience. Its evaluation of the state of existing knowledge was thus based on an inventory and examination of minor as well as major American studies, of selected English, Swedish, and Dutch studies, most of which were empirical and statistical; and on a systematic analysis of German studies, which in general rested less on an empirical than on a theoretical basis.¹⁰

As far as possible, preparation of this inventory and analysis followed an outline that called for specific detail on characteristics of migrants compared with non-migrants (age, sex, nativity, family status, psychophysical status, intelligence, education, occupation and standing in occupation, personality patterns, behavior patterns) in order to determine differentials between migrants and nonmigrants. This outline required equal specificity in regard to situational factors in sending, receiving, and "holding" communities, in order to provide a basis for evaluating changes in status and behavior following migration. Although collation of the results of this inventory of some 200 studies led to "almost no acceptable generalizations about the strength and direction of selective internal migration," the committee was

encouraged in having been able to find, among the 200, five studies that seemed worthy of extended repetition and a dozen or so others that were promising in their implications for future research.

The systematization of substantive findings, the severe criticism of techniques, and the repeated emphasis on realistic models (i.e., systems of data collection and analysis actually in operation in Sweden and the Netherlands) in Bulletin 43 seem to have been important factors in improvements made in American data collection and analysis after 1938. The decennial census of 1940 was the first to include a direct question bearing on internal migration, and the 1950 census also inquired about previous residence. The 1940 data were never adequately tabulated because of the war crisis and budgetary limitations, but present plans for the 1950 data provide for cross-tabulation of migrants in terms of many significant sociodemographic variables and attributes, for comparison with nonmigrants. And between the two censuses, a remarkable series of analyses of migrants were prepared on the basis of the Census Bureau's Current Population Surveys. Concomitantly, Social Security records are being explored in terms of criteria suggested in Bulletin 43. The revised bulletin will, therefore, have a firm substantive basis of American materials that was lacking in the original publication.

The first draft of the revision now in the hands of the present committee suggests, however, that less progress has been made in the analysis of differential migration than in the collection of substantive data. Few new models have been added to the five that in 1938 were considered "a foundation for future research." And, although more than 1,000 new items have been inventoried for the revised bulletin, few of them fulfill the hope expressed in 1938 that research on differential migration would be furthered if investigators were willing to "repeat, extend, and improve the few valid 'experiments'" that had been made. In 1952, as in 1938, much of the recent empirical research on migration differentials seems "trivial and inept." In re-examining and re-evaluating the state of knowledge in 1938, and comparing it with that of 1952, the revised bulletin will therefore attempt to develop plans for research worthy of the new substantive basis that has been built in the intervening years.

¹⁰ Annotated bibliographies of the American and English studies and of the German studies were published as appendixes in the *Research Memorandum*. The Swedish and Dutch studies were analyzed in the text.

LOUIS WIRTH 1897-1952

by Donald Young

LOUIS WIRTH died in his 55th year on May 3, 1952. Readers of *Items* generally are familiar with his distinguished achievements as a sociologist skilled in working both with stark social facts and with more abstract theoretical concepts. They also know his equally distinguished record in the application of social science to practical social affairs, particularly in the fields of race relations, housing, and urban problems. Associated with the University of Chicago during most of his professional career, his influence in both social science and social practice extends throughout the United States and Europe. Within the United States, the Social Science Research Council is one of many institutions deeply indebted to him for counsel and collaboration over many years.

Louis Wirth's first formal association with the Council was in 1930 when he received a Research Fellowship for study in Germany. In subsequent years he served as a member of seven Council committees, and was chairman of two of them. These were the committees on University Social Science Research Organizations (1936-46; chairman 1937-46), Personality and Culture (1937-40), Grants-in-Aid (1938-46), Guide for the Study of Local History (1941-45), Organization for Research (chairman, 1946-52), Housing Research (1946-49), and a special Committee on Cultural Hybrids (1937-40). He was also a member of the staff of the Council in 1937 for the purpose of studying the development of Council policy. The results of this study were mimeographed in August 1937, primarily for the use of the Committee on Review of Council Policy, under the title

"Report on the History, Activities and Policies of the Social Science Research Council," a 163-page document still most useful not only as a well-ordered, accurate source of information about the Council but even more for its excellent analytical discussion of the problems of research organization. A briefer mimeographed document (42 pages) on "The Effect of War on American Minorities" was prepared by him in 1943 for the Subcommittee on Social Aspects of the War, of the Committee on Social Adjustment.

The record of Louis Wirth's association with Council committees is impressive, but the literally innumerable occasions on which he gave less formal assistance would be even more imposing if they could be recounted. He was influential in the development of the Council's interest in improved cooperation between European and American social scientists; he constructively reviewed a number of manuscripts prepared for Council publication; he advised on plans for various activities and projects; he was frequently helpful in the consideration of personnel for Council committees, projects, and awards. He always seemed to have more to do than was reasonable, but he was never too busy to help with something additional when asked. This is the kind of work for which there is no reward other than the satisfaction that comes from service and accomplishment. The Council could not be effective without the unselfish participation by its constituents in its program. In such unselfish cooperation Louis Wirth was exceeded by no one.

COMMITTEE BRIEFS

CROSS-CULTURAL EDUCATION

Wendell C. Bennett (chairman), W. Rex Crawford, Cora Du Bois, Herbert Hyman, Ronald Lippitt, Charles P. Loomis; *staff*, Joseph B. Casagrande, M. Brewster Smith, Bryce Wood.

The committee's research program on cross-cultural education was described in general terms in the March 1952 issue of *Items*. Since that time, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Ford Foundation, and the Rockefeller Foundation have each made grants of \$75,000 to the Council for support of this program over the next three years, and the projects for the first year are being organized. The two major aspects of the program will be operated simultaneously, namely, four domestic studies of students from selected countries in American universities, and corresponding

studies abroad of professional persons educated in the United States who have returned to their home countries. The domestic studies will be under the general direction of M. Brewster Smith of the Council staff. The four project directors will be Ralph L. Beals of the University of California at Los Angeles for Mexico, John W. Bennett of Ohio State University for Japan, Richard D. Lambert of the University of Pennsylvania for India, and William H. Sewell of the University of Wisconsin for Scandinavian countries.

The foreign studies are being organized and directed by Cora Du Bois of the Institute of International Education. The directors of the field projects are: Norman D. Humphrey of Wayne University for Mexico; Herbert Passin of the University of California for Japan; and Franklin Scott of Northwestern University for a Scandinavian country.

John Useem of Michigan State College has been engaged by the Hazen Foundation for a comparable study in India and will collaborate closely with the others.

In addition, some special projects are contemplated. Bryce Wood of the Council staff has under way a survey of the experience of foreign student advisers in American universities. He will also act as liaison between the committee and the directors of government exchange programs. Joseph B. Casagrande will prepare a memorandum appraising the literature on acculturation and related topics that pertain to the interests of the committee. The committee will continue to serve as an advisory and planning body. It is sponsoring the publication of *Exchange of Persons: The Evolution of Cross-Cultural Education* by Guy S. Métraux, to be issued in June as Council Pamphlet 9. W. C. B.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Simon Kuznets (chairman), Shepard B. Clough, Edgar M. Hoover, Wilbert E. Moore, Morris E. Opler, Joseph J. Spengler.

The committee's conference on economic growth in selected countries (Brazil, India, and Japan) was held in New York City on April 25, 26, and 27. Discussion by the approximately 50 participants was focused on trends relating to (a) agriculture and industry, (b) population and labor force, (c) entrepreneurial classes and business organization, and (d) social structure and the state. The principal aim of the conference was to weigh the possibilities of adding to knowledge through the comparative study of economic growth, "possibilities" being judged with respect to the establishment of verifiable explanations of why growth has or has not taken place, and only incidentally with respect to current national or international policy issues. The chairman, in summarizing the several sessions, noted three principal difficulties which have been encountered in comparative study: (1) The use of any particular method of measuring the dimensions of growth automatically entails a narrowing of the empirical frame of reference. (2) The principal conditions of growth cannot be described in quantitative terms and other methods of description have tended to attribute to factors such as the policies of the state or forms of business organization a unity of purpose and motivation which in reality does not exist. (3) The identification of what may be the ultimate determinants of growth requires far more clarification than has been accomplished thus far. There was general agreement that, in spite of the vast literature which has accumulated, the volume of work significant in terms of the problems just enumerated is as yet very small. The practical significance of research in these directions, however, is so great that efforts to plan and initiate more meaningful work must be redoubled.

The conference distributed, for the use of its members, 18 papers dealing with selected factors in the economic growth of the three countries used for illustrative purposes, accompanied in most instances by memoranda by other conference participants. At a meeting on May 13 the committee agreed to attempt the preparation of a volume pre-

senting the principal contents of the conference papers in revised and unified form, with essays by the chairman of each of the conference sessions (Messrs. Kuznets, Moore, and Spengler, and Thomas C. Cochran of the University of Pennsylvania) setting forth the significance of the conclusions reached by the conference. It is hoped that this task can be completed by the end of the year.

IDENTIFICATION OF TALENT

David C. McClelland (chairman), Alfred L. Baldwin, Urie Bronfenbrenner, Fred L. Strodbeck, Dael Wolfe.

The committee met at Cornell University on April 18-19 for discussion of the three research projects in process under its sponsorship. Several preliminary reports were given on studies that are part of the research project under the direction of Fred L. Strodbeck, on cultural factors in the development of talent: cultural variables in earlier studies of gifted children by Orville G. Brim, Jr.; adolescent peer groups and attitudes toward achievement; a core bibliography on talent and achievement of which 15 copies have been prepared by Orville G. Brim, Jr. and F. L. Sultan for the use of those doing research in this area; and methodological studies in preparation for future work with questionnaires and interaction in small groups. Urie Bronfenbrenner and David C. McClelland reported on the progress made in the studies under their direction—on social sensitivity, and on the perception of achievement status in a small community, respectively. John B. Carroll of Harvard University attended the meeting as the committee's guest and presented a paper on the role of abilities in talent identification and development. The committee is exploring possibilities for one or more additional studies to complement those already under way. D. C. McC.

LABOR MARKET RESEARCH

Dale Yoder (chairman), E. Wight Bakke, J. Douglas Brown, Philip M. Hauser, Clark Kerr, Charles A. Myers, Gladys L. Palmer, Carroll L. Shartle.

A conference on research design and methodology in studies of labor mobility was held at the University of Minnesota on May 22-23 under the sponsorship of the committee and of the University. An attempt was made to synthesize the implications of several recent studies, with special emphasis on the six-city mobility study sponsored by the committee, and to arrive at a consensus regarding the directions which future studies should take. An independent critical analysis of major past research in the mobility field has been begun for the committee by Herbert S. Parnes of Ohio State University.

The six-city survey of patterns and factors in labor mobility undertaken in cooperation with the Bureau of the Census and financed by the Department of the Air Force was completed at the end of February. Work history information for a ten-year period was obtained in six cities (Chicago, Los Angeles, New Haven, Philadelphia, St. Paul, and San Francisco) by personal enumeration of a sample of

households. The data were collected, coded, and tabulated by the Bureau of the Census. The tabulations were analyzed and related to other available data by participating research centers at the Universities of Chicago, California at Berkeley, California at Los Angeles, Minnesota, and Pennsylvania, Yale University, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Copies of the series of reports prepared by the seven centers and submitted to the Air Force are not at present generally available but discussions are under way regarding the preparation of a digest of the whole study for general distribution.

NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST

George G. Cameron (chairman), Carleton S. Coon, Douglas D. Crary, Peter G. Franck, Richard N. Frye, J. C. Hurewitz, Majid Khadduri, E. A. Speiser, Lewis V. Thomas; staff, Bryce Wood.

The committee is planning to hold a conference on October 24-25, to which a small number of students of Near Eastern affairs is being invited. The theme of the conference is: "The Near East: Social Dynamics and the Cultural Setting." At a time when important social changes are in prospect or actually taking place in the Near East, the committee considers that light might be thrown on the nature and extent of current developments through studies of the activities and attitudes of various sectors of the population of the countries of the region. Papers prepared for the conference will be distributed to participants in advance of the meeting, in order to maximize the time available for discussion. It is anticipated that a report will be prepared on the proceedings of the conference.

PACIFIC COAST COMMITTEE ON

OLD AGE RESEARCH

Harold E. Jones (chairman), Ray E. Baber, Roy M. Dorcus, Lloyd Fisher, M. Bruce Fisher, James A. Hamilton, Oscar J. Kaplan, Clark Kerr, Elon H. Moore.

The committee met in Los Angeles on April 5, in connection with the annual meeting of the Pacific Sociological Society, to discuss plans for a more permanent organization, on a regional basis, of persons in the field of gerontology. Reports and discussion included a statement by Elon H. Moore concerning field research on retirement, conducted during the past year while he was on sabbatical leave from the University of Oregon, and also a report from the Institute of Industrial Relations of the University of California, concerning a current study of political movements involving older persons.

H. E. J.

PACIFIC COAST COMMITTEE

ON SOCIAL STATISTICS

Maurice I. Gershenson (chairman), Genevieve Carter, Emily Huntington, George M. Kuznets, Davis McEntire, Calvin F. Schmid, Jacob Yerushalmy.

The committee held a meeting in Berkeley on May 1, to discuss the final editing of an inventory of Pacific Coast research in social statistics, and to make plans for two con-

ferences proposed for the coming year. In continuation of technical meetings the committee has sponsored from time to time, plans were made to hold a meeting to analyze statistical techniques in a study of "nursing functions," now under way under the sponsorship of state and national nurses' associations.

H. E. J.

POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

V. O. Key (chairman), Conrad M. Arensberg, Angus Campbell, Alfred de Grazia, Oliver Garceau, Avery Leiserson, M. Brewster Smith, David B. Truman.

A grant of \$90,000 has been made to the Council by the Carnegie Corporation of New York to support research on political behavior related to the 1952 presidential election, to be conducted under the direction of Angus Campbell at the University of Michigan Survey Research Center, with the general guidance and advice of the committee, which participated in the planning of the project. The inquiries to be made will be concerned mainly with the testing of hypotheses about the character of the party system and the nature of electoral behavior developed in the discussions of the committee and from earlier work by the staff of the Center. Specific objectives will be the identification of voters and nonvoters, by party affiliation and geographic areas, with regard to specific characteristics, attitudes, and opinions; comparison of these groups with their counterparts in the 1948 election; analysis of the changing positions of voters, of the effects of party campaigns, of the nature of party identification, and of political participation. Empirical data will be obtained by interviewing national cross-sections of the population, before and after the election.

V. O. K.

SOCIAL BEHAVIOR

Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. (chairman), Leon Festinger, Horace M. Miner, Robert R. Sears, Robin M. Williams, Jr.; staff, M. Brewster Smith.

The committee met on April 18 to evaluate the results of the preliminary conferences on socialization, social integration, and communication that were held during the past winter. A review of the conference on socialization led the committee to recommend the establishment of a subcommittee to plan cross-cultural research in this area. The committee approved the recommendation of the conference that funds be provided by the Council for preparation of a field manual for cross-cultural research on socialization (primarily the process by which children become acceptable members of society), which would utilize materials developed by a seminar under the direction of John Whiting of Harvard University. With the approval of the Committee on Problems and Policy a conference was held on May 23-24 to review the plans for the preliminary draft of the proposed manual to be prepared during the summer. The Committee on Social Behavior will circulate the preliminary draft to scholars with interests and competence in this field, for intensive critical review before a final draft is submitted

for publication. The committee recognized that aspects of research on socialization that are not represented in the group now working on the manual may require contributions from others.

Reviews of the conferences on social integration and on communication reveal that while they did not progress as far toward defining a clear-cut focus and specific problem areas for research as did the conference on socialization, the discussions nevertheless indicated a number of sub-areas in these fields that were of both scientific and practical significance. The committee consequently will pursue its efforts at clarification and development of research plans in these areas and has arranged for additional working conferences for this purpose.

L. S. C.

SOUTHERN ASIA

(Joint with the American Council of Learned Societies)

W. Norman Brown (chairman), Kingsley Davis, Franklin Edgerton, Holden Furber, David G. Mandelbaum, Horace I. Poleman, Lauriston Sharp; *secretary*, Alice Thorner.

At its meeting in New York on April 27, the committee reviewed the substantial development of the whole field of Southern Asia studies which has taken place during the three years that the committee has been in existence. Particularly noted were the renewal of foundation grants to two university centers for area studies, whose continuation the committee had considered of first priority; the announcement by the Ford Foundation of one hundred fellowships for Asian studies; the publication by the Library of Congress of the first issue of the long-awaited periodical bibliography entitled *Southern Asia: Publications in Western Languages, A Quarterly Accessions List*; distribution by the Bureau of International Relations of the University of California of the first number of a new series of *Indian Press*

Digests; inauguration in dozens of American universities of individual and group research projects on South and Southeast Asia, many involving extensive field work; and the great increase in the number of graduate and undergraduate courses on Southern Asia in colleges and universities in all parts of the United States.

The committee also discussed objectives included in its program of recommendations which were still unrealized or only partially achieved. In this category the committee considered the prospects for additional financial support for expanding the scope of the university Southern Asia centers, and explored ways and means of putting these centers on a more permanent basis. The committee then took up the special needs of research and teaching in the languages of Southern Asia, and explored further possibilities of financial support for the establishment in India of the long-planned American Institute in order to facilitate field work.

A. T.

WORLD AREA RESEARCH

Robert B. Hall (chairman), Ralph L. Beals, Wendell C. Bennett, W. Norman Brown, Melville J. Herskovits, Donald C. McKay, Philip E. Mosely, Lauriston Sharp, George E. Taylor; *staff*, Bryce Wood.

Mutual interest on the part of the committee and agencies of the federal government in the experience of area centers with regard to employment opportunities for area specialists has given rise to the proposal that a survey of placement by area centers be made in the fall of 1952. Plans for such a survey were initiated by the committee at a meeting on May 16. The committee also made preliminary plans for a small conference of social scientists and experts in the field of public health, to examine field training and research problems of interest to both groups.

PERSONNEL

FACULTY RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS

At its meeting on March 31 the Committee on Faculty Research Fellowships—Blair Stewart (chairman), Paul H. Buck, Paul W. Gates, Harold E. Jones, Donald G. Marquis, Dorothy S. Thomas, Schuyler C. Wallace, and Malcolm M. Willey—selected five fellows for three-year appointments beginning in the fall of 1952. With the cooperation of their respective institutions the fellows will be enabled to devote at least half of their time to their own research while carrying on reduced teaching schedules. The appointments were as follows:

John W. Atkinson, Assistant Professor of Psychology, University of Michigan, for research on human motivation and its measurement.

William K. Estes, Associate Professor of Psychology, Indiana University, for the construction and testing of mathematical theories of behavior.

Andreas G. Papandreou, Professor of Economics, University of Minnesota, for experimentation in the fields of the theories of choice and organization, and investigation of the empirical relevance of economic theory.

Kenneth D. Roose, Assistant Professor of Economics, Oberlin College, for research on business fluctuations.

James Tobin, Associate Professor of Economics, Yale University, for quantitative testing of economic theory and estimation of relationships, especially in the field of consumer spending and saving.

RESEARCH TRAINING FELLOWSHIPS

The Committee on Social Science Personnel—E. P. Hutchinson (chairman), Donald T. Campbell, John A. Clausen, Earl Latham, Richard A. Lester, and Paul Webbink—met on April 9–10 and awarded 26 new research training fellowships:

- Robert E. M. W. Agger, Ph.D. candidate in political science, University of Oregon, for research on political behavior and dynamics of interest groups in a small city.
- Norman Birnbaum, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Harvard University, for training at Marburg University and research in Germany on the social basis of urban Lutheranism.
- Harold J. Breen, Ph.D. candidate in psychology, University of Western Ontario, for research and study in Canada and the United States on verbal and non-verbal projective tests.
- Henry W. Bruck, Ph.D. candidate in politics, Princeton University, for research in the United States and Canada on decision making on a common problem in foreign relations.
- Edward M. Bruner, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, University of Chicago, for research on cultural persistence in a North American Indian community.
- Otto W. Butz, Ph.D. candidate in politics, Princeton University, for research in Germany on political science and society in 1918–33.
- James W. Carper, Ph.D. candidate in psychology, Johns Hopkins University, postdoctoral fellowship for research on problems of change in poorly structured attitudes.
- Sally W. Cassidy, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, University of Chicago, for research on the process of definition of the situation using a modified Thematic Apperception Test.
- B. Robert Clark, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, University of California at Los Angeles, for research on leadership and planning in the Los Angeles school system.
- Sydney H. Croog, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Yale University, for research on children given psychiatric treatment and their siblings.
- Harry H. Eckstein, Ph.D. candidate in political science, Harvard University, for research in Great Britain on the administration of the National Health Service and on the political process in Britain.
- Roy G. Francis, Ph.D. in sociology, University of Wisconsin, and Assistant Professor of Sociology, Tulane University, for further training in mathematics.
- Thomas M. Gale, Ph.D. candidate in history, University of Pennsylvania, for sociological training and research on urbanism.
- Charles E. Gilbert, Ph.D. candidate in political science, Northwestern University, for sociological training and for research on the role of a United States Senator as a member of Congress.
- Irwin L. Herrnstadt, Ph.D. candidate in industrial economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for research on adjustment of trade unions to economic change.
- Robert M. Huntington, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Harvard University, for research on social interaction between spouses.

- Alan C. Kerckhoff, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, University of Wisconsin, for research on factors influencing the choice of cultural reference group by marginal children in an American Indian community.
- John T. Krause, Ph.D. candidate in history, New York University, for training and research in the United States and Europe on the historical demography of France.
- Joseph G. LaPalombara, Ph.D. candidate in political science, Princeton University, for research in Italy on the democratic labor movement.
- Louise E. Prober Lerdau, Ph.D. candidate in economics, University of Wisconsin, for research in New Zealand on the role of public finance in shaping economic development.
- James G. March, Ph.D. candidate in political science, Yale University, postdoctoral fellowship for research on the relation of multigroup membership to the political behavior of American women.
- John W. Mellor, Ph.D. candidate in agricultural economics, Cornell University, for research on the economics of mechanization in agriculture.
- Morris Rosenberg, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, Columbia University, for research on vocational value judgments of college students.
- Robert E. Thomas, Ph.D. candidate in history, Columbia University, for research on ratification of the federal Constitution in Virginia.
- Nicholas A. Wahl, Ph.D. candidate in political science, Harvard University, for research in France on Gaullist political leadership.
- Donald E. Walker, Ph.D. candidate in psychology, University of Chicago, postdoctoral fellowship for training in linguistics.

AREA RESEARCH TRAINING FELLOWSHIPS AND TRAVEL GRANTS

The Committee on Area Research Training Fellowships—Fred Eggan (chairman), Cyril E. Black, W. Rex Crawford, Cora Du Bois, Richard Hartshorne, and Robert S. Smith—met on April 7–8. The following 28 fellowship appointments were made:

- David E. Apter, Ph.D. candidate in politics, Princeton University, for research in Africa on development of responsible self-government in the Gold Coast.
- John A. Armstrong, Jr., Ph.D. candidate in public law and government, Columbia University, for research in Europe on Ukrainian nationalism, 1941–45.
- Joan V. Bondurant, Ph.D. candidate in political science, University of California, for research in India on the influence of Gandhian ideology on government and politics.
- Conrad Brandt, Ph.D. candidate in political science, Harvard University, postdoctoral fellowship for research in the United States, Japan, and Hong Kong on the origins of the Chinese Revolution.
- George Chung-Li Chang, Ph.D. candidate in economics and Far Eastern studies, University of Washington, for research in the United States on the distribution of income in China.
- Oscar L. Chavarria-Aguilar, Ph.D. candidate in linguistics, University of Pennsylvania, postdoctoral fellowship for social linguistic research in Pakistan on the Pashto language.

- Bernard S. Cohn, Ph.D. candidate in cultural anthropology, Cornell University, for research in India on the castes of a North Indian village.
- Harold C. Conklin, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Yale University, for research in the Philippines on the Hanunóo and the cultural landscape of Southern Mindoro.
- Robert H. Ewald, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, University of Michigan, for research in Guatemala on Ladino-Indian relationships in a Highland Indian community.
- Donald R. Fagg, Ph.D. candidate in social relations, Harvard University, for sociological research in Java on a representative community.
- Gordon D. Gibson, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, University of Chicago, for research in Africa on the social organization and acculturation of the Herero.
- Walter E. Gourlay, Ph.D. candidate in history, Harvard University, for research in the United States on Chinese Communist historiography.
- Edward C. Haskins, Ph.D. candidate in geography, University of Minnesota, for research in Brazil on the agricultural geography of East Central Bahia.
- William A. Douglas Jackson, Ph.D. candidate in geography, University of Maryland, for postdoctoral training in Russian studies.
- Phyllis L. Le Roy, Ph.D. candidate in history, Radcliffe College, for research in Southern Rhodesia on its recent political history.
- Kermit E. McKenzie, Ph.D. candidate in history, Columbia University, for research in the United States on world revolution and the Soviet Union in Comintern theory, 1928-43.
- William Mangin, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Yale University, for research in Peru on the drinking of alcoholic beverages in a Mestizo village and an Indian hacienda.
- Irene W. Meister, Ph.D. candidate in area studies, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, for research in the United States on Soviet Union policy in the Near East.
- Douglas H. Mendel, Jr., Ph.D. candidate in political science, University of Michigan, for research in Japan on political behavior.
- William S. Metz, Ph.D. candidate in South Asia Regional Studies, University of Pennsylvania, for research in Pakistan on the rise of Muslim nationalism.
- Robert J. Miller, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, University of Washington, for research in the United States on the role of the lamasery in Inner Mongolia.
- David C. Munford, Ph.D. candidate in history, Columbia University, for research in the United States on Lenin's doctrine on revolution in backward countries.
- Maureen L. P. Patterson, M.A. candidate in South Asia Regional Studies, University of Pennsylvania, for research in India on relations between Brahmans and non-Brahmans in Maharastra.
- Fahim I. Qubain, Ph.D. candidate in political science, University of Wisconsin, for research in the Middle East on the political, economic, and social effects of the oil industry.
- Robert A. Rupen, Ph.D. candidate in political science, University of Washington, for research in Europe on Russian materials on Outer Mongolia, and study of Soviet Central Asia.
- Robert B. Textor, Ph.D. candidate in social anthropology, Cornell University, for research in Thailand on attitudes and communications of farmers in relation to economic development programs.
- John M. Thompson, Ph.D. candidate in Russian History, Columbia University, for research in the United States on the relations between Russia and the West, 1919-20.
- Alvin W. Wolfe, Ph.D. candidate in anthropology, Northwestern University, for ethnographic research among the Ngombe of the Belgian Congo.

Travel grants for area research were awarded to the following 15 scholars:

- Charles S. Blackton, Assistant Professor of History, Colgate University, for research in Australia on the development of nationality and loyalty to Empire, 1850-1900.
- Gwendolen M. Carter, Associate Professor of Government, Smith College, for research in South Africa on the party system and its relation to racial problems.
- Alex N. Dragnich, Associate Professor of Political Science, Vanderbilt University, for research in Yugoslavia on the structure and functioning of the political system.
- Henry W. Ehrmann, Professor of Political Science, University of Colorado, for research in France on management organizations.
- Melville J. Herskovits, Professor of Anthropology, Northwestern University, for research in Africa on the adjustment of native cultures to the role of Africa in the modern world.
- Harold C. Hinton, Assistant Professor of History, Georgetown University, for research in England on British trade with China.
- George Kish, Associate Professor of Geography, University of Michigan, for research in the Netherlands and France on regional planning techniques.
- Huey Louis Kostanick, Assistant Professor of Geography, University of California at Los Angeles, for research on the postwar population structure in Greece and the resettlement of Bulgarian Turks in Turkey.
- Donald C. McKay, Professor of History, Harvard University, for research in Italy on the Risorgimento.
- John C. Pelzel, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, Harvard University, for research in Japan on the development of social institutions in an urban industrial community.
- Lauriston Sharp, Professor of Anthropology, Cornell University, for research in Thailand on induced technological change and a survey of technical and economic aid projects elsewhere in Southeast Asia.
- K. H. Silvert, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Tulane University, for research on the theory and practice of government in Guatemala.
- Dan Stanislawski, Professor of Geography, University of Texas, for research on the culture regions of Portugal.
- Betty Warren Starr, Research Associate, Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago, for research in Mexico on levels of integration in two rural areas.
- Charles Wagley, Associate Professor of Anthropology, Columbia University, for research in Brazil on the relationship of the rural community to the regional and national culture.

GRANTS-IN-AID

At its annual meeting on March 27 the Committee on Grants-in-Aid—George W. Stocking (chairman), Ray A. Billington, Richard S. Crutchfield, Henry W. Ehrmann, and John W. Riley, Jr.—made awards to 31 scholars in support of their individual research projects:

- Selig Adler, Associate Professor of History, University of Buffalo, for a study of the neoisolationist movement, 1918–29.
- O. Fritiof Ander, Professor of History, Augustana College, for research in Sweden on Swedish immigration and immigrants in the United States.
- Robert Anderson, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, Florida State University, for research on social and ceremonial organization of the Northern Cheyenne.
- Robert G. Athearn, Assistant Professor of History, University of Colorado, for research on W. T. Sherman and Indian policy after the Civil War.
- Paul H. Beik, Associate Professor of History, Swarthmore College, for research in France on political and social philosophies of the French Revolution.
- Leslie V. Brock, Professor of History, The College of Idaho, for research on the currency of the American colonies, 1700–1775.
- David Bushnell, Instructor in History, University of Delaware, for research in Colombia on Colombian trade and tariff policy in the late nineteenth century.
- F. Hilary Conroy, Assistant Professor of Far Eastern History, University of Pennsylvania, for study of materials on Japanese expansion in Northeastern Asia.
- Louis Filler, Assistant Professor of American Civilization, Antioch College, for a study of abolition and reform, 1830–60.
- E. K. Francis, Associate Professor of Sociology, University of Notre Dame, for a theoretical study of the ethnic group.
- Alexander Gerschenkron, Associate Professor of Economics, Harvard University, for research in Europe on European industrial development.
- Alfred J. Hanna, Vice President and Weddell Professor of American History, Rollins College, and Kathryn Abbey Hanna, for research in France on French intervention in Mexico, 1861–67.
- Mark D. Hirsch, Teacher, High School of Music and Art, New York City, for study of New York City political history from Tweed to LaGuardia.
- William Jaffé, Associate Professor of Economics, Northwestern University, for research in Switzerland, Italy, and England on the work of Léon Walras.
- John James, Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of Oregon, for experimentation on the behavior of small groups.
- Frank L. Klement, Assistant Professor of History, Marquette University, for research on midwestern Copperheadism, 1861–65.
- Samuel J. Konefsky, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Brooklyn College, for further research on the ideas of Justices Holmes and Brandeis.
- George E. Lewis, Associate Professor of History, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, for further research on Samuel Wharton, Indian trader and land speculator.

Gerard J. Mangone, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Swarthmore College, for research in Trieste on power rivalries.

Alexander Marchant, Professor of History, Vanderbilt University, for research in Brazil on relations between the United States and Brazil.

Edmund A. Moore, Professor of History, University of Connecticut, for research on the church-state issue in the 1928 presidential campaign in the United States.

Robert E. Quirk, Instructor in History, Indiana University, for research in Mexico on the ideology of the Mexican Revolution, 1910–13.

Martin Ridge, Assistant Professor of History, Westminster College, Pennsylvania, for research on the public career of Ignatius Donnelly.

Simon Rottenberg, Director, Labor Relations Institute, University of Puerto Rico, for a field investigation of industrial conflict on the island of Grenada, British West Indies.

Ronald V. Sires, Professor of History, Whitman College, for research in England on Liberal reform, 1906–14.

Adolf F. Sturmthal, Professor of Economics, Bard College, for research in the United States on labor in British and French nationalized industries.

George B. Tindall, Acting Assistant Professor of History, University of Mississippi, for research on the public career of Wade Hampton of South Carolina.

Julius Turner, Associate Professor of Political Science, Allegheny College, for research on the competition of political parties in the United States.

Andrew H. Whiteford, Associate Professor of Anthropology, Beloit College, for research in Colombia on the social structure of the city of Popayan.

William R. Willoughby, Associate Professor of History and Government, St. Lawrence University, for research on the politics of the Great Lakes—St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

Henry R. Winkler, Assistant Professor of History, Rutgers University, for research in England on British labor and the League of Nations.

FACULTY RESEARCH GRANTS

At its meeting on March 7 the Committee on Faculty Research Grants—Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. (chairman), W. J. Brogden, Philip Davidson, Eldon L. Johnson, and Ralph W. Tyler—made grants to the following nine liberal arts colleges to support social science faculty members on part-time research during the academic year 1952–53:

Colgate University, to support research by Wilfrid H. Crook, Professor of Economics, on the general strike; and by George Schlessler, Professor of Education, on a test for certain personality traits.

Earlham College, to support research by Thomas S. Bassett, Assistant Professor of History, on Quaker history and the history of Richmond, Indiana, in the century of urban-industrialism.

Hartwick College, to support research by Alban W. Hoopes, Professor of History, on the history of American Indians west of the Mississippi; and by Paul M. Orso, Assistant Professor of Psychology, on the role of religion in marital and family adjustments.

Hope College, to support research by Dwight B. Yntema, Professor of Economics and Business Administration, and Kenneth J. Weller, Assistant Professor of Economics and Business Administration, on the measurement of inequality in income distribution.

Indiana Central College, to support research by Kenneth E. St. Clair, Professor of History and Political Science, on the administration of justice during the Reconstruction period, with special reference to federal bankruptcy.

Kenyon College, to support research by Hoyt L. Warner, Assistant Professor of History and Political Science, on a political biography of John Hessin Clarke; and by Raymond English, Associate Professor of History and Political Science, on the funda-

mentals of democracy in the United States and England.

Knox College, to support research by David M. Pletcher, Associate Professor of History, on American promoters in Mexico, 1867-1911; and by Charles O. Lerche, Jr., Professor of Political Science, on the question of the Indian minority in the Union of South Africa before the United Nations.

Saint Olaf College, to support research by Clifford Hauberg, Professor of History and Education, on the economic and social history of Panama.

Westminster College, Missouri, to support research by Chester Alexander, Professor of Sociology, on social factors in longevity; and by David March, Associate Professor of History, on the Radical Republican movement in Missouri.

PUBLICATIONS

SSRC BULLETINS AND MONOGRAPHS

Social Behavior and Personality: Contributions of W. I. Thomas to Theory and Social Research, edited by Edmund H. Volkart. June 1951. 348 pp. Cloth, \$3.00.

Support for Independent Scholarship and Research by Elbridge Sibley. Report of an inquiry jointly sponsored by the American Philosophical Society and the Social Science Research Council. May 1951. 131 pp. \$1.25.

Area Research: Theory and Practice, Bulletin 63, by Julian H. Steward. August 1950. 183 pp. \$1.50.

Culture Conflict and Crime, Bulletin 41, by Thorsten Sellin. 1938; reprinted September 1950. 116 pp. \$1.00.

Tensions Affecting International Understanding: A Survey of Research, Bulletin 62, by Otto Klineberg. May 1950. 238 pp. Paper, \$1.75; cloth, \$2.25.

PAMPHLETS

Exchange of Persons: The Evolution of Cross-Cultural Education, Pamphlet 9, by Guy S. Métraux. June 1952. 58 pp. 50 cents.

Area Studies in American Universities by Wendell C. Bennett. 1951. 92 pp. \$1.00.

Domestic Control of Atomic Energy, Pamphlet 8, by Robert A. Dahl and Ralph S. Brown, Jr. 1951. 122 pp. \$1.00.

DIRECTORY OF FELLOWS

Fellows of the Social Science Research Council 1925-1951. New York, 1951. 485 pp. Limited distribution. \$5.00.

All publications listed are distributed from the New York office of the Council.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

Directors 1952: RALPH L. BEALS, WENDELL C. BENNETT, RAY A. BILLINGTON, GORDON A. CRAIG, J. FREDERIC DEWHURST, FRED EGGAN, CHARLES FAIRMAN, ROBERT B. HALL, PENDLETON HERRING, WILLARD HURST, HAROLD A. INNIS, OTTO KLINEBERG, ALEXANDER LEIGHTON, DONALD G. MARQUIS, DOUGLAS MCGREGOR, LOWRY NELSON, ROY F. NICHOLS, FREDERICK OSBORN, DON K. PRICE, THEODORE W. SCHULTZ, ROBERT R. SEARS, MORTIMER SPIEGELMAN, GEORGE W. STOCKING, CONRAD TAEUBER, DOROTHY S. THOMAS, SCHUYLER C. WALLACE, S. S. WILKS, MALCOLM M. WILLEY, HOLBROOK WORKING, DONALD YOUNG

Officers and Staff: PENDLETON HERRING, *President*; PAUL WEBBINK, *Vice-President*; ELBRIDGE SIBLEY, *Executive Associate*; HAROLD E. JONES, *Pacific Coast Representative*; BRYCE WOOD; ELEANOR C. ISBELL; JOSEPH B. CASAGRANDE; M. BREWSTER SMITH; CAROLYN E. ALLEN, *Financial Secretary*

